REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendments and remarks is requested. This response moves language from claim 24 into claim 23, and cancels claims 20-22 and 24. This response also amends claims 1-6, 8, 10, 12-14, 16-18, 23, and 25, to replace the noun "media" with "medium" according to the proper tense, and to broaden certain claims.

Claims 1-19, 23, and 25 remain pending. Claims 1, 4, 8, 12, 17, and 23 are the independent claims.

ARGUMENT

The Office Action rejects all claims based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent application publication no. 2004/0156503 A1 to Alan Bell et al. (hereinafter "Bell"). Applicant respectfully traverses those rejections with respect to the pending claims.

For a valid rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." (MPEP § 2131.01, quoting from Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Claim 1 recites a machine readable medium comprising a writeable area, a read only area, "a first media validation data" stored on the writeable area of the medium, and "a second media validation data" stored on the read only area of the medium. In addition, claim 1 recites that the second media validation data is "equal to the first media validation data." Thus, a machine readable medium according to claim 1 includes at least two copies of the "media validation data," with a first copy stored in the writeable area, and a second copy stored in the read only area.

As explained in the Detailed Description, this particular arrangement can allow for validation of a media key block (MKB). For instance, when the copy of the media validation data in the writeable area resides within an MKB, unauthorized modification to the MKB can cause that copy of the media validation data to differ from the copy stored in the read only area of the medium. (E.g., see Figure 1 and page 6, lines 4-18).

Like claim 1, claims 4, 8, 12, 17, and 23 also involve a first copy of validation data stored on a writeable area of a medium, and a second copy of the validation data stored on a read only area of the medium, where either the second copy of the validation data is equal to the first copy, or access is denied if the first and second copies are unequal.

Bell pertains to a method for preventing unauthorized copying of data from disks. In particular, according to Bell, for "each blank disk to which content is to be copied," a "unique media identification" is written to "a read-only area of the disk before it is initially recorded" (Abstract). This "unique media identification" is then used to generate a "content key," and the content key is then used to encrypt the content to be recorded to the disk (page 3, para. 439 to page 4, para. 43).

Bell does not disclose storing two equal copies of media validation data to a medium, with one copy stored in a read-only area of the medium, and the other copy stored in a writeable area of the medium. Bell therefore does not anticipate any of the pending claims.

The Office Action cites to the Abstract and to paged 3 and 4 of Bell to support the assertion that Bell disclose storing two equal copies of media validation data to a medium, with one copy stored in a read-only area and the other copy stored in a writeable area. Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion that Bell discloses storing two equal copies of media validation data to a medium, with one copy stored in a read-only area of the medium, and the other copy stored in a writeable area of the medium.

As indicated above, Bell discusses "a unique media identification" for each disk, but Bell does not disclose saving two copies of the unique media identification to each disk, one copy in a read only area and the other copy in a writeable area.

To the contrary, Bell only discloses storing the unique media identification in a read only area (Abstract; page 3, para. 39).

Bell also discloses various keys and other values to be used when copying content to a medium or reading content from the medium. However, Bell does not disclose storing multiple copies of any of those values on the medium, with one copy stored in a read only area of the medium, and another copy stored in a writeable area of the medium.

For reasons including those set forth above, Bell does not anticipate any of pending independent claims of the present application. In addition, since the dependent claims implicitly include the features of their respective parent claims, Bell does not anticipate any of the pending claims of the present application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-19, 23, and 25 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (512) 732-3927. Prompt issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/4/05

/ Michael R. Barre /

Michael R. Barré
Registration No. 44,023
Patent Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
(512) 732-3927

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

1-4-2005
Date of Deposit

Gayle Bekish
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Gayle B 1-4-2005
Signature Date